Application No.: 10/099,781 Amendment dated March 8, 2005

Reply to Office Action December 5, 2005

Docket No.: 29137.029.00

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 10, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Currently, claims 1-22 are pending. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 10 is allowable and that claim 5 includes allowable subject matter. Claim 6 has been amended to correct the minor informality.

The Office Action indicates that the abstract is objected to because it does not meet the format requirements. A new abstract has been provided. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

The Office Action also objected to claim 6 because of a minor informality. The Applicants have corrected claim 6 accordingly, and ask the Examiner to withdraw this objection.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6-9 and 11-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Chinese Patent No. 1338499. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, the Examiner has indicated that providing a certified translation of the priority documents would overcome this rejection, thus, for the sole purpose of expediting the prosecution of this application, a true and correct English translation of the Priority Documents is attached. The Applicants have therefore perfected the foreign priority, and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Moreover, the Office Action provisionally rejected claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-22 under the judicially created doctrine of obvious double patenting over Application Serial No. 10/431,349. Because the provisional double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining

Application No.: 10/099,781 Docket No.: 29137.029.00 Amendment dated March 8, 2005

Reply to Office Action December 5, 2005

in this application, Applicants respectfully ask that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow the application to issue as directed under M.P.E.P. §804(I)(B).

Furthermore, Applicants present that claim 1 is generic to the restricted species. Because the rejections of claim 1 have been overcome, Applicants respectfully request that the species be rejoined and allowed as per M.P.E.P. §809.02(c). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims 1-22 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Finally, Applicants have submitted an Information Disclosure Statement listing two articles by Smet et al. A copy of these article was previously submitted in the co-pending Divisional Application Serial Number 10/718,083. Applicants respectfully request consideration of these documents.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/099,781 Docket No.: 29137.029.00

Amendment dated March 8, 2005

Reply to Office Action December 5, 2005

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any

overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: March 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Song K. Jung

Registration No.: 35,210

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant